

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended.

On page 2 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 7, along with various dependent claims, are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,425,008 (Lecheler et al.); and on page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claims 4 and 5 are rejected as being unpatentable over the Lecheler patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed that when a management computer receives event information including the identifier tag and when the management computer needs to display or use the source of an event, the management computer can, for example, derive the domain name of the collection computer from the identifier tag contained in the event (see, e.g., the specification at paragraph [0024]). Further, the event tagging can send with every event an identifier tag that can contain the identifier, for example, the name or domain name, of the collection computer or group of collection computers from where the event came (see, e.g., the specification at paragraph [0023]). Such an exemplary identification of domain of a collection station or a group of collection computers at the management station provides for a unique identification of the source of an event, even if there is a group of collection computers sharing a like identity (e.g., specification at paragraph [0019]).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claims 1 and 7. For example, the Lecheler patent does not disclose or suggest "deriving, by the at least one management computer, an identification of at least one collection computer from

the identifier tag based on a domain name; and identifying to a user the source of an event using the identification of the at least one collection computer, the at least one collection computer being at least one of a collection computer and a group of collection computers," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly cited in claim 7.

The Lecheler patent discloses remote management of private networks having duplicate network addresses (title). The Lecheler patent relies on uniquely configuring the managed customer networks (16) within a customer domain (12) such that the customer networks which have duplicate network addresses are assigned to different level one managers (abstract). As shown in Fig. 1, no duplicate pairs of network identifiers 16 are assigned to a common Level 1 manager 34. The Lecheler patent does not teach or suggest identifying to a user the source of an event using the identification of the at least one collection computer, the at least one collection computer being at least one of a collection computer and a group of collection computers, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly cited in claim 7.

Further, the Lecheler patent uses a level one manager to detect errors within a customer domain 12, and to produce an error signal as well as a unique location identifier (which identifies a location of the error). See column 4, lines 15-42. A unique identification of the source of the event is not resolved at a management computer by deriving an identification of at least one collection computer from an identifier tag based on a domain name. The Lecheler patent does not teach or suggest deriving an identification of at least one collection computer 34 at a management computer 40, the at least one collection computer being at least one of a collection computer and a group of collection computers, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly cited in claim 7.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant's claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the Lecheler patent. The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the document relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC



Date: December 20, 2005

By: _____

Ry No. 48,360
Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620